UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,665	01/24/2001	Tuyet-Huong Thi Nguyen	016295.0624	3786

7590   05/19/2006

Roger Fulghum
Baker & Butts, L.L.P.
One Shell Plaza
910 Louisiana
Houston, TX 77002-4995

EXAMINER
KING, JUSTIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2111	

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *3/9/06*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-8,16 and 19-23* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,4-8,16 and 19-23* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459

(1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

> 1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
> 2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
> 3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
> 4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3.   Claims 1, 4-8, 16, and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over the admitted prior art in view of Goodman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,282,601) and Smith et

al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,643,227).

Referring to claim 1: The admitted prior art discloses writing parameters for the SMI

routines to a predetermined register of a first processor (Specification, page 3, lines 4-6),

executing in the first processor a command of a software application to cause the first processor

to initiate a system management interrupt (Specification, page 2, lines 8-17), receiving at each

processor an instruction that the system management interrupt has been issued (Specification,

page 2, lines 19-20), entering system management mode at each processor (Specification, page 2,

lines 20-21), and saving register contents of each processor to a memory space associated with

each respective processor (Specification, page 2, lines 22-24). The admitted prior art's

parameters for the SMI routines are the claimed predetermined signature.

The admitted prior art further discloses that a different processor, other than the

processor initiating the interrupt, may be selected for handling the interrupt (Specification, page

3, lines 13-16); thus, the admitted prior art discloses selecting from among the multiple

processors a second processor as a system management interrupt handler.

Neither the admitted prior art discloses selecting the second processor according to an

arbitration scheme nor the admitted prior art discloses scanning the content of the memory for

the selected second processor to process the interrupt.

Goodman discloses an interrupt handling method in a multiprocessor environment.

Goodman discloses scanning the content of the memory for the selected second processor to

process the interrupt (figure 4, steps 126, 128, and 130); and when the second processor locates

the saved predetermined signature in one of the memory spaces associated with the processors of

the computers system, using the contents of the memory space associated with the predetermined

signature for any parameters necessary for the handling of the system management interrupt

(figure 4, steps 134, 136, and 138). Goodman teaches one to identify the requesting processor

without having to satisfy severe interrupt timing constraint (column 1, lines 66-67, column 2,

lines 1-5). Although Goodman discloses and teaches one to scan the processor register in

handling interrupt, Goodman does not explicitly disclose an arbitration scheme in selecting one

processor to execute the interrupt.

Smith discloses assigning tasks to the idle processor (abstract). Smith teaches one to

distribute the task to the processor based on the processor's current workload.

Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art to

adapt the teachings of Goodman and Smith onto the admitted prior art because Goodman teaches

one to identify the requesting processor without having to satisfy severe interrupt timing

constraint and Smith teaches one to balance each processor's workload by distributing the task

according to the processor's current workload

Referring to claim 4: Claim 1's argument applies; furthermore, since Smith teaches one

to select the processor based on the workload; it can be any processor, including the one just

causes the SMI.

Referring to claim 5: The admitted prior art discloses the processors' access to chip set's

I/O port as one standard well-known system activities (Application, page 3, lines 8-9). Goodman

also discloses that the processor writes to the memory (figure 1, structure 26) via the chip set's

port (figure 1, structure 18).

Referring to claims 6-7: Both the admitted prior art (Specification, page 2, line 11) and

Goodman (figure 1, structure 50) disclose the chip sets as a PCI bridge.

Referring to claim 8: The admitted prior art discloses the step of issuing from the

expansion bridge the instruction causing the processor to enter the system management mode

(Specification, page 2, lines 10-17). Goodman discloses that each of the processors of the

system to enter system management mode (column 1, lines 50-54).

Referring to claim 16: The admitted prior art discloses issuing an instruction from a first

processor of the system to a chip set (Specification, page 2, lines 10-11), receiving the instruction

at the chip set and in response issuing a command causing the processors to enter system

management mode (Specification, page 2, lines 12 and 18-19), writing parameters for the SMI

routines to a predetermined register of a first processor (Specification, page 3, lines 4-6), and

saving register contents of each processor to a memory space associated with each respective

processor (Specification, page 2, lines 22-24). The admitted prior art's parameters for the SMI

routines are the claimed predetermined signature.

The admitted prior art further discloses that a different processor, other than the

processor initiating the interrupt, may be selected for handling the interrupt (Specification, page

3, lines 13-16); thus, the admitted prior art discloses selecting from among the multiple

processors a second processor as a system management interrupt handler and then transmitting

the software system management interrupt to the selected second processor.

Neither the admitted prior art discloses selecting the second processor according to an

arbitration scheme nor the admitted prior art discloses scanning the content of the memory for

the selected second processor to process the interrupt.

Goodman discloses an interrupt handling method in a multiprocessor environment.

Goodman discloses scanning the content of the memory for the selected second processor to

process the interrupt (figure 4, steps 126, 128, and 130); and when the second processor locates

the saved predetermined signature in one of the memory spaces associated with the processors of

the computers system, using the contents of the memory space associated with the predetermined

signature for any parameters necessary for the handling of the system management interrupt

(figure 4, steps 134, 136, and 138). Goodman teaches one to identify the requesting processor

without having to satisfy severe interrupt timing constraint (column 1, lines 66-67, column 2,

lines 1-5). Although Goodman discloses and teaches one to scan the processor register in handling interrupt, Goodman does not explicitly disclose an arbitration scheme in selecting one processor to execute the interrupt.

Smith discloses assigning tasks to the idle processor (abstract). Smith teaches one to distribute the task to the processor based on the processor's current workload.

Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art to adapt the teachings of Goodman and Smith onto the admitted prior art because Goodman teaches one to identify the requesting processor without having to satisfy severe interrupt timing constraint and Smith teaches one to balance each processor's workload by distributing the task according to the processor's current workload.

Referring to claim 19: The admitted prior art discloses the processors' access to chip set's I/O port as one standard well-known system activities (Application, page 3, lines 8-9). Goodman also discloses that the processor writes to the memory (figure 1, structure 26) via the chip set's port (figure 1, structure 18).

Referring to claims 20-21: Both the admitted prior art (Specification, page 2, line 11) and Goodman (figure 1, structure 50) disclose the chip sets as a PCI bridge.

Referring to claims 22-23: The admitted prior art discloses receiving at each processor an instruction that the system management interrupt has been issued (Specification, page 2, lines 19-20) and entering system management mode at each processor (Specification, page 2, lines 20-21).

The admitted prior art further discloses that a different processor, other than the processor initiating the interrupt, may be selected for handling the interrupt (Specification, page 3, lines 13-

16); thus, the admitted prior art discloses selecting from among the multiple processors a second processor as a system management interrupt handler.

But the admitted prior art does not disclose selecting the second processor according to an arbitration scheme. The admitted prior art also does not disclose scanning, locating, and retrieving the content of the memory for the selected second processor to process the interrupt.

Goodman discloses an interrupt handling method in a multiprocessor environment. Goodman discloses scanning the contents of the memory space associated with each processor (figure 4, steps 126, 128, and 130); and when the second processor locates the saved predetermined signature in one of the memory spaces associated with the processors of the computers system, using the contents of the memory space associated with the predetermined signature for any parameters necessary for the handling of the system management interrupt (figure 4, steps 134, 136, and 138). Goodman teaches one to identify the requesting processor without having to satisfy severe interrupt timing constraint (column 1, lines 66-67, column 2, lines 1-5). Although Goodman discloses and teaches one to select a processor to handle the interrupt, Goodman does not explicitly disclose an arbitration scheme in selecting the processor.

Smith discloses assigning tasks to the idle processor (abstract). Smith teaches one to distribute the task to the processor based on the processor's current workload.

Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art to adapt the teachings of Goodman and Smith onto the admitted prior art because Goodman teaches one to identify the requesting processor without having to satisfy severe interrupt timing constraint and Smith teaches one to balance each processor's workload by distributing the task according to the processor's current workload.

Response to Arguments

4.   In response to Applicant's arguments that Goodman, when considered as a whole,

teaches away from the alleged invention because Goodman discloses only one dedicated

processor to handle the interrupt (Remark, pages 7-12); Applicant recites the MPEP 2144.02 to

support that the prior art must be considered in its entirety as a whole (Remark, page 11, last line,

page 12, 1st paragraph): Applicant may have meant MPEP 2141.02 instead of 2144.02. While

MPEP 2141.02 states that the prior art should be considered as a whole including the portion that

would lead away from the claimed invention, Applicant have overlooked that the MPEP 2141.02

also states that the prior art's mere disclosure of more than one alternative does not constitute a

teaching away from any of these alternatives because such disclosure does criticize, discredit, or

otherwise discourage the solution claimed (In re Fulton 391 F. 3d. 1195, 1201). Both the

invention as a whole and Goodman are directed to a method of handling interrupts. Whether the

interrupt is handled by one dedicated processor or by a selected processor based on a

predetermined arbitrating scheme, it presents no new or unexpected result for the interrupt. The

prior art Smith discloses assigning tasks to the idle processor (abstract). Smith teaches one to

distribute the task to the processor based on the processor's current workload. Smith teaches the

deficiency of the Goodman.

Conclusion

5.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Justin I. King whose telephone number is 571-272-3628. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 9:00 am to 5:00 pm. If attempts

to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart

can be reached on 571-272-3632 or on the central telephone number, (571) 272-2100. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-

8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lastly, paper copies of cited U.S. patents and U.S. patent application publications will

cease to be mailed to applicants with Office actions as of June 2004. Paper copies of foreign

patents and non-patent literature will continue to be included with office actions. These cited

U.S. patents and patent application publications are available for download via the Office's

PAIR. As an alternate source, all U.S. patents and patent application publications are available

on the USPTO web site (www.uspto.gov), from the Office of Public Records and from

commercial sources. Applicants are referred to the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at

http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/index.html or 1-866-217-9197 for information on this policy. Requests

to restart a period for response due to a missing U.S. patent or patent application publications

will not be granted.

Justin King
May 11, 2006

MARK H. RINEHART
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100